UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,143	07/26/2001	Masaki Yamamoto	SHIG19990241	7584
7590 04/01/2004			EXAMINER	
Norman P Soloway			KAO, CHIH CHENG G	
Hayes Soloway Hennessey Grossman & Hage				
130 W Cushing Street Tucson, AZ 85701			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
· No.	09/890,143	YAMAMOTO, MASAKI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Chih-Cheng Glen Kao	2882			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was railure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 Se	eptember 2003.				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.				
, —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>8-11</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>8-11</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 September 2003</u> is/a</li> <li>Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1</li> </ul>	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 09/890,143

Art Unit: 2882

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Drawings**

1. The drawings were received on 9/2/03. These drawings are acceptable.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweeney et al. (US Patent 6235434) in view of Itou et al. (US Patent 5272744).
- 3. Regarding claim 8, Sweeney et al. discloses a method comprising the steps of forming a multilayer film (Fig. 1, #110) on a substrate (Fig. 1, #120) and adjusting a wavefront phase by cutting away a portion of a surface thereby roughening the surface (Abstract).

However, Sweeney et al. does not specifically disclose the film composed of high and low refractive index materials.

Itou et al. teaches the film composed of high and low refractive index materials (col. 1, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the method of Sweeney et al. with the film composed high and

Application/Control Number: 09/890,143

Art Unit: 2882

low refractive indices of Itou et al., since one would be motivated to incorporate this for producing higher reflectivity in the x-ray region (col. 1, lines 45-46) as shown by Itou et al.

- 4. Regarding claim 10, Sweeney et al. further discloses cutting controlled by detecting a difference between a plurality of materials (col. 4, lines 57-60).
- 5. Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweeney et al. in view of Itou et al. as respectively applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Murakami (US Patent 6160867).

For purposes of being concise, Sweeney et al. in view of Itou et al. suggests a method as recited above. Sweeney et al. further discloses cutting a correction film (Fig. 1, #130, and Abstract).

However, Sweeney et al. does not disclose a number of cycles larger than necessary to substantially saturate a reflectance.

Murakami teaches a number of cycles larger than necessary to substantially saturate a reflectance (col. 1, lines 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify the suggested device of Sweeney et al. in view of Itou et al. with the number of cycles of Murakami, since one would be motivated to have that many cycles to obtain as high an interface-amplitude reflectance as possible as implied from Murakami (col. 1, lines 20-25).

Application/Control Number: 09/890,143

Art Unit: 2882

# Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Cheng Glen Kao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2492. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (9 am to 5 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

4

gk

DAVID V. BRUCE PRIMARY EXAMINER